

COURTS IN GRAHAM COUNTY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PLAN 2012-2014 SUMMARY



LOCAL INITIATIVES, DRIVERS, AND PRESSURES

- Improve video appearance capability, align with state standards and expand to LJ courts.
- Expand office space and increase physical security at LJ courts.
- Free physical storage space by digitizing archival documents and contributing to State Archives.

CY 2010 ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- Implemented AJACS at Superior Court in April 2010.
- Published court-specific content and court calendar on new county website.
- Established videoconferencing for initial appearances in two superior court courtrooms.
- Upgraded digital recording software to address Vista compatibility issues.
- Continued sharing field trainer with Greenlee County courts.

Statewide Projects: Impacts, Concerns, and Participation Plans

LJ CMS/Bench Auto	Recognize the need and advantages but in no hurry to implement; will be late adopters.
JOLTSaz/SWID	Generally positive assessment; concern about functionality of the planned interface; will be a mid-cycle adopter.
LJ EDMS	Safford Justice pursuing standalone OnBase, rest of courts interested in disconnected scanning to support e-filing; will be late adopters.
e-Filing/Std Forms	Recognize importance of e-filing but need to improve business practices first; will be late adopters.
Architecture	Don't perform local development; some architecture items in containment status.

TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS					
Project	Year/ Status	Project Detail Provided			Comments
		Full¹	Skeletal²	Mention³	
Implement EDMS	FY12		X		Justice Court Precinct #1; local JCEF
Videoconference Hearings by Remote	FY12		X		Superior Court, Pima Justice, Thatcher Muni
Digitize Archive Documents	FY13		X		Superior Court / OSAM / SLAPR
Video Surveillance	FY13		X		Pima Justice; state JCEF

Note 1:

An “X” in “Full” indicates that the court has provided full detailed information about the project according to the general parameters outlined in the Commission on Technology’s Project Management Methodology. Also, risk analysis, impact, project costs and funding information has been provided.

Note 2:

An “X” in “Skeletal” indicates that the court provided detail about the local project in the master projects listing spreadsheet. Complete information, usually risks, impact analysis, project costs and funding, was not provided.

Note 3:

An “X” in “Mention” indicates that the court mentioned this project in a summary or listed it in an initiative. It may have been a phrase or a full paragraph of description, but did not contain detailed project-oriented information. If these projects are related to pursuing standards or directions already adopted (e.g., OnBase EDMS implementation, Jury+ upgrade, digital audio in the courtroom), then any mention which includes appropriate funding information is sufficient.